REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. All pending claims are rejected.

Claims 4, 8, 15 and 18 are objected to because of informalities regarding Markush groups. Claims 4, 8, 15 and 18 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner in order to correct any informality.

Claims 1-3, 9-11, 14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,192,365 ("Draper") in view of US Patent 5,758,300 ("Abe"). Claims 5-8, 12-13, 16-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draper in view of Abe and further in view of US Patent No. 5,974,238 ("Chase"). The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 USC 103(a) is respectfully traversed as the combination of cited references does not teach or suggest the present invention as claimed.

The present invention teaches that "[i]ntermittently and preferably wirelessly, such as whenever a given client device connects to the central network for any reason, each client device synchronizes its logic tree data objects with those in the central database." (Specification, page 9, lines 9-12). By only synchronizing the logic tree data objects, the stated problems in prior art updating methods are overcome. The logic tree data objects are claimed in claim 1 ("data objects, said data objects defining logic trees") and also in claim 10 ("a plurality of data objects and said data objects defining logic trees").

It is clear from a fair reading of the specification that the actual logic tree data object is being synchronized. That is, the information regarding the logic tree is itself a data object that is the subject of the synchronization.

In contrast, none of the cited references mention or suggest logic tree data objects. The only single reference to a logic tree is found in Draper as pointed out by the Examiner. The single sentence in Draper is as follows: Hierarchies are often represented by tree structures. This is notoriously well known in the art.

Applicants do not deny that objects in a database can be related by their relative position and that such relative positions can be represented by a tree structure. However, Draper is absolutely silent on creating a data object that is itself a tree structure that can be synchronized in a portable client device as is claimed in claims 1 and 10.

The references to Abe and Chase do not mention tree structures.

None of the Draper, Abe, or Chase references teach or suggest tree structure data objects that are synchronized in a portable client devices as claimed in claims 1 and 10. Therefore, the combination of these references also does not teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 10, and the combination fails under 35 USC 103(a).

For these reasons claims 1 and 10 are deemed to be patentable over the cited references and allowable under 35 USC 103(a). The remaining claims 2-9 and 11-20 are also deemed to be allowable as depending directly or indirectly from an allowable base claim.

No fee is believed due for this submittal. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

Oct. 21, 2004

Peter J. Meza, No. 32,920
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(719) 448-5906 Tel
(303) 899-7333 Fax